REMARKS

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed September 15, 2004 which has a response due on December 15, 2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-5 and 7-14 were pending in the application; rejected claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 102(e); and rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 5,218,607 to Saito et al.; 5,453,805 to Itoh; 6,119,611 to Tomita (References A, B and F in the April 26, 2004 Office Action); and 6,137,534 to Anderson (Reference A in the May 19 and December 10, 2003 Office Actions) were cited. Claim 15 has been added and thus, claims 1-5 and 7-15 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Response to Arguments on pages 6-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the limitation added to the independent claims "fails to add any additional patentable limitation to the claims" (page 7, lines 2-3), "because if the data [is] already stored in the memory why do you want to store again for nothing" (page 7, lines 5-6). The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. It is a common practice in many areas of the computer art to save information without checking to see whether the information being saved has already been saved. The limitations added to the independent claims in the Amendment filed July 26, 2004 require that the system checks to see whether information has been saved prior to saving. Any system that does not perform such a check would not meet the limitations recited in the independent claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to cite specifically where each of the three references identified as anticipating the present invention clearly teach checking to see whether "display information for indicating a display state of a currently displayed image" (e.g., claim 1, lines 9-10) has been saved prior to saving it. The Examiner's attention is directed to the preceding quotation which defines "display information" not as the image itself, but rather "information for indicating a display state of a currently displayed image" (e.g., claim 1, lines 9-10).

In the July 26, 2004 Amendment, the teachings of the anticipatory references were not addressed, because the April 26, 2004 Office Action (to which the July 26, 2004 Amendment responded) did not reject claim 6 as anticipated by any of Saito et al., Itoh or Tomita. Claim 6 was dependent from claim 1 and recited "if display information to be written in said non-volatile storage unit is the same as a value stored in said non-volatile storage unit, said display information writing unit does not write the display information." The Examiner is respectfully requested to explain how this limitation differs from the limitation added to the independent claims in the July 26, 2004 Amendment if the independent claims are anticipated by Saito et al., Itoh, Tomita, but claim 6 was not.

6

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the differences between the claimed invention and <u>Anderson</u> in the last paragraph on page 6 of the Office Action. Claim 6 is not directed to "instant review mode", but rather the ability to return a device to its previous display state after the device is turned off, without performing unnecessary operations as the device is turned off. As discussed in the July 26, 2004 Amendment, the claimed invention has nothing whatsoever to do with the inability of the device taught by <u>Anderson</u> that "once a user leaves instant review mode through the software command, the last image may not be recalled onto the screen by switching back to instant review mode" (column 12, lines 4-6). According to the present invention, if a device is turned off and then back on, the last displayed image is displayed. However, if the current display state was saved before initiation of turning off the device, the display state is not saved when the device is turned off. Thus, a device according to the present invention is able to perform something that a device taught by <u>Anderson</u> apparently cannot, i.e., display a previously displayed image.

New Claim 15

Claim 15 has been added to recite a method according to the invention which includes "writing display state information indicating the display state of the currently displayed image in the non-volatile storage unit if the display state information is not already stored in the non-volatile storage unit" (claim 15, last 3 lines) which as discussed above is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Summary

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 and 7-15 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art taken individually or in combination. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _3/15/05_   By: _Richard A. Gollhofer_
                                         Richard A. Gollhofer
                                         Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501